

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

MATHEW ST. HILAIRE,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	1:25-cv-00362-NT
)	
WELLPATH HOLDINGS INC, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	

**RECOMMENDED DECISION AFTER REVIEW
OF PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, who is in custody at the Maine State Prison, alleges that he did not receive the necessary medical care while at the prison. (Complaint, ECF No. 1.) In addition to his complaint, Plaintiff filed a motion to proceed without prepayment of fees and costs (ECF No. 4), which motion the Court granted. (Order, ECF No. 5.) In accordance with the governing statute, a preliminary review of Plaintiff’s complaint is appropriate. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

Following a review of Plaintiff’s complaint, I recommend the Court dismiss the complaint, unless Plaintiff amends the complaint to allege an actionable claim.

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed his complaint on a form complaint seeking to assert a claim pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹ Plaintiff’s allegations consist of the following:

¹ Section 1983 “‘is not itself a source of substantive rights,’ but merely provides ‘a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.’” *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994) (quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 144 n.3 (1979)). To maintain a claim under section 1983, a plaintiff must establish: “1) that the conduct complained of has been committed under color of state law, and 2) that this

“The Defendant failed to treat medical illness repeatedly left Plaintiff in pain for 3½ years;”

“Failure to treat;”

“Failure to provide follow up treatment;”

“Refusal to provide necessary medical care;” and

“Intentional Infliction of emotional distress.”

(Complaint at 3.)

LEGAL STANDARD

28 U.S.C. § 1915 is designed to ensure meaningful access to the federal courts for individuals unable to pay the cost of bringing an action. When a party is proceeding pursuant to the statute, however, “the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines,” *inter alia*, that the action is “frivolous or malicious” or “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). “Dismissals [under § 1915] are often made sua sponte prior to the issuance of process, so as to spare prospective defendants the inconvenience and expense of answering such complaints.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989).

When considering whether a complaint states a claim for which relief may be granted, courts must assume the truth of all well-plead facts and give the plaintiff the benefit of all reasonable inferences therefrom. *Ocasio-Hernandez v. Fortuno-Burset*, 640 F.3d 1, 12 (1st Cir. 2011). A complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its

conduct worked a denial of rights secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States.” *Barreto-Rivera v. Medina-Vargas*, 168 F.3d 42, 45 (1st Cir. 1999).

face.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “A self-represented plaintiff is not exempt from this framework, but the court must construe his complaint ‘liberally’ and hold it ‘to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.’” *Waterman v. White Interior Sols.*, No. 2:19-cv-00032-JDL, 2019 WL 5764661, at *2 (D. Me. Nov. 5, 2019) (quoting *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)). “This is not to say that pro se plaintiffs are not required to plead basic facts sufficient to state a claim.” *Ferranti v. Moran*, 618 F.2d 888, 890 (1st Cir. 1980).

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff’s federal claim pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is governed by the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution. The Eighth Amendment prohibits the infliction of “cruel and unusual punishments.” U.S. Const. amend. VIII. From this prohibition, “courts have derived the principles that govern the permissible conditions under which prisoners are held and that establish the medical treatment those prisoners must be afforded.” *Kosilek v. Spencer*, 774 F.3d 63, 82 (1st Cir. 2014) (citing *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 832 (1994)). “The Eighth Amendment, applied to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment, protects incarcerated people from state corrections officials’ ‘deliberate indifference to serious medical needs.’” *Zingg v. Groblewski*, 907 F.3d 630, 634-35 (1st Cir. 2018) (quoting *Feeney v. Corr. Med. Servs., Inc.*, 464 F.3d 158, 161-62 (1st Cir. 2006); see *Perry v. Roy*, 782 F.3d 73, 78 (1st Cir. 2015). To allege “a claim of deliberate indifference based on inadequate or delayed medical care, ‘a plaintiff must satisfy both a subjective and objective inquiry.’” *Perry*, 782 F.3d at 78 (quoting *Leavitt v. Corr. Med. Servs.*, 645 F.3d 484, 497 (1st Cir. 2011)).

To demonstrate a claim under the objective prong, a plaintiff “must show that she has a serious medical need for which [h]e has received inadequate treatment.” *Kosilek*, 774 F.3d at 85. For a medical condition to be objectively “serious,” there must be “a sufficiently substantial ‘risk of serious damage to [the inmate’s] future health.’” *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 843 (quoting *Helling v. McKinney*, 509 U.S. 25, 35 (1993)). This “requires that the need be ‘one that has been diagnosed by a physician as mandating treatment, or one that is so obvious that even a lay person would easily recognize the necessity for a doctor’s attention.’” *Kosilek*, 774 F.3d at 82 (quoting *Gaudreault v. Municipality of Salem, Mass.*, 923 F.2d 203, 208 (1st Cir. 1990)). However, this “does not impose upon prison administrators a duty to provide care that is ideal, or of the prisoner’s choosing.” *Id.* (citations omitted). “Rather, the Constitution proscribes care that is ‘so inadequate as to shock the conscience.’” *Id.* at 83 (quoting *Torraco v. Maloney*, 923 F.2d 231, 235 (1st Cir. 1991)).

Under the subjective prong, “a plaintiff must show ‘that prison officials possessed a sufficiently culpable state of mind, namely one of deliberate indifference to an inmate’s health or safety.’” *Perry*, 782 F.3d at 78 (quoting *Leavitt*, 645 F.3d at 497). Thus, “even if medical care is so inadequate as to satisfy the objective prong, the Eighth Amendment is not violated unless prison administrators also exhibit deliberate indifference to the prisoner’s needs.” *Kosilek*, 774 F.3d at 83. “For purposes of this subjective prong, deliberate indifference ‘defines a narrow band of conduct,’ and requires evidence that the failure in treatment was purposeful.” *Id.* (citation omitted) (quoting *Feeney*, 464 F.3d at 162); see *Perry*, 782 F.3d at 79 (stating that deliberate indifference “requires evidence that

the absence or inadequacy of treatment is intentional”). A constitutional claim may arise when “the treatment provided [was] so inadequate as ‘to constitute an unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain or to be repugnant to the conscience of mankind.’” *Leavitt*, 645 F.3d at 497 (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 105-06 (1976)). However, “when a plaintiff’s allegations simply reflect a disagreement on the appropriate course of treatment, such a dispute with an exercise of professional judgment may present a colorable claim of negligence, but it falls short of alleging a constitutional violation.” *Feeney*, 464 F.3d at 162 (alterations and quotation marks omitted). Moreover, “[p]rison officials ‘who actually knew of a substantial risk to inmate health or safety may be found free from liability if they responded reasonably to the risk, even if the harm ultimately was not averted.’” *Giroux v. Somerset County*, 178 F.3d 28, 33 (1st Cir. 1999) (quoting *Farmer*, 511 U.S. 825 at 844); see *Burrell v. Hampshire Cnty.*, 307 F.3d 1, 8 (1st Cir. 2002) (recognizing that the focus of the deliberate indifference analysis “is on what the jailers knew and what they did in response”).

Plaintiff’s complaint does not include sufficient detail to state an actionable Eighth Amendment claim of inadequate medical care. See *Byrne v. Maryland*, No. 1:20-cv-00036-GZS, 2020 WL 1317731, at *5 (D. Me. Mar. 20, 2020) (rec. dec.), aff’d, 2020 WL 2202441 (D. Me. May 6, 2020) (stating a plaintiff must include “the crucial detail[s] of who, what, when, where, and how” in pleading); *Aschcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (stating the pleading rules “demand[] more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.”); *Slotnick v. Garfinkle*, 632 F.2d 163, 165 (1st Cir. 1980). For instance, Plaintiff has not alleged the condition from which he suffered or the

treatment that was requested but not provided. In short, Plaintiff's allegations are "devoid of [the] further factual enhancement" necessary to state a cause of action. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557) (internal quotation marks omitted)). Dismissal, therefore, is warranted.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing analysis, after a review of Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, unless within fourteen days of the date of this Recommended Decision, Plaintiff amends his complaint to allege an actionable claim, I recommend the Court dismiss the complaint.

NOTICE

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge's report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) for which de novo review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within fourteen (14) days of being served with a copy thereof.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to de novo review by the district court and to appeal the district court's order.

/s/ John C. Nivison
U.S. Magistrate Judge

Dated this 4th day of August, 2025.